

Interrogatory Responses Deficiencies

This list does not include all deficiencies, only the most important.

Interrogatory Question	Produced (if any relevant information was produced)	Deficiency
1. Identify all persons who answered or participated in answering these interrogatories for Defendant, in a form similar to the one below, or by identifying them in each interrogatory response:	The only names related to third posting.	<p>Did not identify individuals for first and second posting, including interview team, hiring manager, screeners, posters, or any of the documentation.</p> <p>Continues to omit individuals associated with EEO complaints which has been identified matter relevant to the subject matter involved in the case.</p>
2. Identify all individuals who had input, were associated, involved in any way with any aspect of the CPHC CEO application process from posting to the final selection, and identify all documentation related to the posting and selection process and any communications to applicants, in a form similar to the one below. (Defendant removed from response)	Only provided information related to the third posting.	<p>No documentation which identifies individuals for first and second posting, including interview team, hiring manager, screeners, posters, or any of the documentation.</p> <p>Continues to omit individuals associated with EEO complaints as identified.</p> <p>N.B. It is false that the requested first and third posting documents are information that are already in the Plaintiff's possession and knowledge.</p> <p>No information has been provided with regard to the</p>

Interrogatory Question	Produced (if any relevant information was produced)	Deficiency
		requested EEO investigations related to this litigation.
3. Describe the selection process in step-by-step detail as to how candidates were evaluated and selected for subject position.	Only information related to the third posting has been provided.	<p>Defendant refuses to provide step-by-step detail of the selection process for the first and second posting which is relevant to the EEO case.</p> <p>The step-by-step selection for the first and second postings can be obtained in a manner similar to third posting and is matter relevant to the subject matter involved in the case.</p>
4. Identify all individuals who had input into the decision to repost the CPHC CEO position three times and any documentation and communication related to this decision.	Only information related to the third posting has been provided.	Defendant continues to refuse to provide matter relevant to the EEO subject matter involved in the case., e.g., documentation from the first and second posting showing Plaintiff was selected as most qualified candidate multiple times prior to the selection of Chad Lovett.
5. Identify all reasons that Chad Lovett was a more qualified applicant for the CPHC CEO position than Plaintiff.	Only information related to the third posting has been provided.	<p>No documentation which identifies individuals for first and second posting,</p> <p>Defendant continues to refuse to provide matter relevant to the EEO subject matter involved in the case.</p>

Interrogatory Question	Produced (if any relevant information was produced)	Deficiency
6. For the following individuals, describe any negative statements or comments made by Janet Thomas or Debra Fitzgerald to the individual including but not limited to statements about Plaintiff's ability and qualifications for the CPHC CEO position between the date Plaintiff was appointed to the position and through the date of these responses and identify any documentation or communications related to the same, including but not limited to emails.	Nothing provided.	<p>No responsive documentation was produced.</p> <p>Just as an example, Debra Fitzgerald's negative reference regarding CEO posting was not provided.</p>
7. Identify every individual who has been the subject of an OSI investigation between January 1, 2016, and the date of the responses to these interrogatories, and whether the individual's email and/or computer access was removed, in a form similar to the one below:	No answer provided.	<p>No responsive documents were produced.</p> <p>These documents not in the Plaintiff's possession, contrary to Defendant's statement.</p> <p>We are willing to limit this interrogatory to those individuals in Health Services, Prison Administration (not Prisons themselves), DPS leadership team, who are at a manager level or higher; and who has been the subject of an OSI investigation between January 1, 2018, and the</p>

Interrogatory Question	Produced (if any relevant information was produced)	Deficiency
		date of the responses to these interrogatories; and whether the individual's email and/or computer access was removed during the investigation.
8. Between January 1, 2016, and the date of the responses to these interrogatories, identify all persons who have any knowledge about alleged unacceptable personal conduct or unsatisfactory job performance by Plaintiff and identify all documentation related to the same.	No answer provided.	No responsive documents were produced.
9. Identify all positions to which Defendant DPS has appointed an individual to act on an interim basis between January 1, 2016, and the date of the responses to these interrogatories, for each position provide the following information: (Defendant removed from response)	No answer provided.	<p>No responsive documents were produced.</p> <p>These documents not in the Plaintiff's possession, contrary to Defendant's statement.</p> <p>We are willing to limit this interrogatory to those individuals in Health Services, Prison Administration (not Prisons themselves), DPS leadership team (Archdale), who are at a manager level or higher; between January 1, 2018, and the date of the responses to these interrogatories; who was appointed to interim</p>

Interrogatory Question	Produced (if any relevant information was produced)	Deficiency
		positions and received the related full-time.
10. Identify the individuals who applied for the DPS Director of Nursing position and Director of Informatics position when Valerie Langley was selected for these positions and all documents related to the selection process for each position.	No answer provided.	No responsive documents were produced. These documents not in the Plaintiff's possession, contrary to Defendant's statement.
11. Identify the individuals who applied for the DPS Medical Director and CPHC Medical Director positions when Anita Wilson was selected for each of these positions and all documents related to the selection process for each position	No response provided.	No responsive documents were produced. These documents not in the Plaintiff's possession, contrary to Defendant's statement.
12. Identify who decided not to offer the CPHC CEO position to Plaintiff after each set of interviews for the position and the reason for not offering Plaintiff the position.	No response provided for postings other than the third posting.	No responsive documents were produced for first and second interview. The first and second CEO posting interview documents not in the Plaintiff's possession, contrary to Defendant's statement.
13. Identify any complaints filed against Plaintiff since January	No response provided.	No responsive documents were produced especially and just as one example,

Interrogatory Question	Produced (if any relevant information was produced)	Deficiency
2016 and identify all documents related to such complaints.		documents showing the number of Documented Counseling Sessions (DCS) and Written Warnings required by DEA which Plaintiff, as interim CEO, was directed to oversee and relation of complaints, if any, to this directive; or relation to attendance per NC Auditor and compliance, etc.
14. Identify all of Chad Lovett's experience that was the reason for his selection as the CPHC CEO, including but not limited to the following types of experience: (Defendant has list but removed)	No response provided.	No responsive documents were produced including but not limited to documentation showing that Lovett had executive correctional experience.
15. Identify all individuals who have served as CPHC CEO since the facility opened in 2011 and the salary history of each individual in that position.	No response provided.	No responsive documents were produced.